

Rec'd PCT

13 SEP 2004

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:  
RICHARD S. ROBERTS  
ROBERTS & MERCANTI, LLP  
P.O. BOX 484  
PRINCETON, NJ 08542-0484

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Applicant's or agent's file reference		Date of Mailing (day/month/year)
H0002489 PCT		30 JAN 2004
International application No.	International filing date (day/month/year)	REPLY DUE within 1 months/days from the above date of mailing
PCT/US02/15256	10 April 2002 (10.04.2002)	Priority date (day/month/year)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
IPC(7): H01L 21/312, 21/316; C08J 9/26; C09D 183/02, 183/04 and US Cl.: 427/96, 245, 246, 387		
Applicant		
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
  - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
  - II ☐ Priority
  - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
  - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
  - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
  - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
  - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
  - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.
 

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.  
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.  
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 10 August 2004 (10.08.2004).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer Erma Cameron Telephone No. 703-308-0661
---	--

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:  
RICHARD S. ROBERTS  
ROBERTS & MERCANTI, LLP  
P.O. BOX 484  
PRINCETON, NJ 08542-0484

## PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

To: RICHARD S. ROBERTS ROBERTS & MERCANTI, LLP P.O. BOX 484 PRINCETON, NJ 08542-0484		Date of Mailing (day/month/year)
Applicant's or agent's file reference  H0002489 PCT		REPLY DUE  within 1 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No.  PCT/US02/15256	International filing date (day/month/year)  10 April 2002 (10.04.2002)	Priority date (day/month/year)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  IPC(7): H01L 21/312, 21/316; C08J 9/20; C09D 183/02, 183/04 and US Cl.: 427/96, 245, 246, 387		
Applicant  HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
  - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
  - II ☐ Priority
  - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
  - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
  - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
  - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
  - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
  - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

**When?** See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

**How?** By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

**Also** For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.  
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 *bis*.  
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 10 August 2004 (10.08.2004).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer  Erma Cameron  Telephone No. 703-308-0661
---	--

**I. Basis of the opinion**

**1. With regard to the elements of the international application:\***

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:  
 pages 1-35 \_\_\_\_\_, as originally filed  
 pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_, filed with the demand  
 pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_, filed with the letter of \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ the claims:  
 pages 36-43 \_\_\_\_\_, as originally filed  
 pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19  
 pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_, filed with the demand  
 pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_, filed with the letter of \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ the drawings:  
 pages 1 \_\_\_\_\_, as originally filed  
 pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_, filed with the demand  
 pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_, filed with the letter of \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:  
 pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_, as originally filed  
 pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_, filed with the demand  
 pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_, filed with the letter of \_\_\_\_\_

**2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.**  
 These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language \_\_\_\_\_ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

**3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:**

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

**4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:**

- ☐ the description, pages NONE \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ the claims, Nos. NONE \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE \_\_\_\_\_

**5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

\* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.  
PCT/US02/15250

**V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1. STATEMENT**

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>1-46</u>	YES
	Claims <u>47-53</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>1-46</u>	YES
	Claims <u>47-53</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-53</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

**2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS**

Claims 1-46 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a process or composition comprising a silicon pre-polymer, a porogen and a catalyst that is either an onium compound or a nucleophile.

Claims 1-53 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

Claims 47-53 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by EP 1142832. '832 teaches a low dielectric constant silicon oxide film made from TEOS, MTES and an onium salt such as tetramethylammonium acetate.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

EP 1142832 A1 (MANDAL et al) 10 October 2001, see pages 4-6 and Invention Example 1.

WRITTEN OPINION

International Application No.  
PCT/US02/

**Supplemental Box**

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

**TIME LIMIT:**

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.